

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated January 25, 2005, claims 1, 5, 8, 9, 11, 15, 18, 19, 21, 25, 28, and 29 have been amended. Claims 1-30 remain in the application. Entry of these amendments, and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 24, 26, 28, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) and Rock et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,039,047 (Rock). On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 2-3, 5, 12-13, 15, 22-23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA, Rock and Amro et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,333,745 (Amro). On page 5, paragraph 4, of the Office Action, claims 7, 17, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA, Rock, and Microsoft® Word 2000 ©1999 (Word) as supported by screenshots. On page 5, paragraph 5, of the Office Action, claims 9, 19, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA, Rock, and LaStrange et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,784,058 (LaStrange). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

A. Claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 14, 16, 21, 24, and 26 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The independent claims were rejected as follows:

Referring to claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 14, 16, 21, 24, and 26, the AAPA teaches a method, article of manufacture, and system for collapsing ("minimizing") a dialog window of an application that displays a complete dialog window of a currently active application (i.e., Fig. 1) on a display device, determines a location of a cursor with respect to the dialog window (i.e., if the cursor is over minimize button 108), displays a collapsed version of the dialog window, wherein the collapsed version of the dialog window consumes a smaller area of the display device than the complete dialog window, and displays the complete dialog window when the cursor moves within the collapsed version of the dialog window (i.e., when the cursor moves within the collapsed version of the dialog window (i.e., when the cursor selects the "maximize option within the minimized dialog window). See page 4, line 22-page 5, line 13.

The AAPA teaches collapsing a dialog window when a minimize button is pressed and not when a cursor is simply moved outside of the complete dialog window without additional action. The AAPA also does not teach displaying the complete dialog window when the cursor is moved within the collapsed version without additional action. However, Rock teaches a method of resizing a control region (col. 4, lines 4-14) when a cursor is moved outside of the control region (col. 1, lines

20-32 and col. 3, lines 47-51) such that the control region is made smaller upon the cursor moving outside of the region and larger upon the cursor moving inside the control region. Since collapsing is a type of resizing and a dialog window is a type of control region, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the dialog window of the AAPA such that the collapsing occurs upon the cursor moving outside of the dialog window as taught by Rock in order to provide a simple and efficient way to make the dialog window (control region) less distracting as supported by Rock without requiring the dexterity to select a small "minimize button".

Applicant traverses the above rejections. Specifically, neither the AAPA nor Rock (nor the other cited references) teach, disclose or suggest a dialog window that can be collapsed through cursor movement as claimed.

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21, are generally directed to collapsing a dialog window. More specifically, the independent claims provide for merely moving the cursor outside of the complete dialog window to cause the collapsed version of the dialog window to display. Further, merely moving the cursor within the collapsed version of the dialog window causes the complete dialog window to display. As specifically set forth in the both the amended independent and dependent claims, no buttons on either the complete dialog window or collapsed dialog window need to be depressed or selected. The AAPA, as admitted in the Office Action, requires the user to select a minimize button or a maximize button to cause the collapsing or expansion of the dialog windows. Accordingly, the AAPA fails to teach this aspect of the invention.

In responding to prior arguments, the final Office Action submits that the claims failed to:

clearly state that the collapsing of the dialog box is based solely on cursor movement (i.e., there are no statements that buttons may not be involved, etc.)...

In view of the above remarks in the final Office Action, Applicant has amended the claims to clearly state that the collapsed version of the dialog window is displayed "without depressing a button of the dialog window". Accordingly, the arguments previously submitted and restated above are consistent with the current claim language.

Applicant again reasserts that Rock's control region is not similar or even remotely equivalent to the claimed dialog window or collapsed dialog window. As clearly set forth in Rock, the control region is an area of the display that controls the display of images in another area of the display (see col. 2, lines 34-51). In this regard, the control region is not equivalent or even similar to a dialog window.

The final Office Action submits that the medical images are displayed in windows which would indicate to one of ordinary skill in the art that the methods used in conjunction with the

windows of Rock could be used with other types of windows. However, a dialog window which is clearly defined in the present application and understood in the art has a specific meaning and is not equivalent to a standard window or a display area that is used to display images. In this regard, The Computer Language Company Inc., Copyright (©) 1981-2004 available at <http://www.techweb.com/encyclopedia/defineterm.html?term=dialog+box> defines a dialog window as:

A movable window that is displayed on screen in response to the user selecting a menu option. It provides the current status and available options for a particular feature in the program. Dialog boxes are typically small, but depending on the amount of information that must be conveyed, they can sometimes be large.

Rock's images are not displayed in response to a user selecting a menu option. Instead, Rock's images are always displayed. Further, Rock may display different images by selecting a control region and not a menu option. Rock's images also fail to provide current status and available options for a particular feature in the program. In addition, Rock's images and control regions are not movable. Dialog windows as claimed and set forth in the specification are movable.

All of the above differences clearly differentiate the presently claimed dialog boxes from both the AAPA and Rock's control regions and images. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the independent claims clearly overcome the cited references.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that these claims are now in condition for allowance.

B. Claims 8, 18, and 28 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

In rejecting these claims and replying to the previously submitted response, the final Office Action provides that there is no statement as to who defines the time or how it is defined. The final Office Action further stated that the time it takes for the computer to recognize the cursor position is a defined time.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses such statements. The time it takes for a computer to recognize a cursor position is not a defined time. Instead, it is merely the time used by the CPU to conduct the relevant processing. Such CPU processing is not defined by anyone at all. Nonetheless, to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly state that the time is defined in the application that displays the dialog window. Accordingly, such a defined

time is not a time a CPU takes to recognize a cursor position but is a time that is specifically defined by an application.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claims 8, 18, and 28 are in condition for allowance.

C. Claims 9, 19, and 29 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

These amended claims set forth specific limitations. Namely, these claims provide for a selectable system icon that controls the ability to display a collapsed dialog window without depressing a button as set forth in the independent claims. More specifically, the ability to merely move the cursor to display the collapsed version of the dialog window (without depressing a button) is either active or inactive depending on the status of the selectable system icon. In this regard, if the selectable system icon is active, the user has the ability to display a collapsed or complete dialog window merely by moving the cursor in/out of the dialog window without depressing any button. However, if the selectable system icon is not selected and is inactive, the ability to display a collapsed or complete dialog window merely by moving the cursor in/out of the dialog window without depressing a button is inactive. In this regard, the user must use traditional measures (e.g., the minimize or maximize buttons) to display the desired window.

Such a unique ability to control whether or not the movement of a cursor displays a complete or collapsed dialog window is not contemplated in the cited references. Applicant notes that in rejecting these claims, the final Office Action relies on LaStrange. As set forth in LaStrange and in the text of the final Office Action, LaStrange provides a pushpin that allows the contents of a window to be removed if selected. However, if the pushpin is not selected, the window remains persistent and cannot be changed. LaStrange is specifically directed towards displaying pages in a browser. A "sticky page selecting module" selects whether or not a first page is to persist on a display after a second page for display is selected by the browser system.

Such persistence is not even remotely similar to the present invention. The present invention is not directed towards determining if a page should be removed from a display when a second page is selected. Instead, the presently claimed invention is directed towards whether certain functionality associated with a cursor is active or not (i.e., if the movement of the cursor outside of a dialog window will function to collapse the dialog window or not). Such functionality and the ability

to control such functionality using a selectable icon is not contemplated or even remotely hinted at in LaStrange or the other cited references.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that these claims are in condition for allowance.

D. Claims 2, 3, 12, 13, 22, and 23 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

Claims 2, 12, and 22 provide that the collapsed version of the dialog window comprises a title bar of the dialog window. In rejecting these claims, the final Office Action relies on Amro FIG. 4 item 144. Applicant notes that Amro defines the title bar in col. 5, lines 58-60. Specifically, the title bar comprises application icon 114, a textual title 116, AND a decoration field 118. Accordingly, in order to teach the claim limitation, Amro's collapsed version must have the application icon 114, the textual title 116, and the decoration field 118. As can be clearly seen in FIG. 4, item 144 merely contains the icon 114 and the textual title 116 without the decoration field 118. Thus, the collapsed version of Amro's window fails to show the title bar.

In addition, it should be noted that both the full title bar 108 and the active application bar 106 are displayed at the same time. The active application bar 106 merely shows those applications that are currently active. Accordingly, the user did not activate the display of active application bar 106 using the cursor.

Claims 3, 13, and 23 provide specific limitations stating that the collapsed version of the dialog window comprises a size that exactly encompasses the title of the dialog window and system buttons. The name "system buttons" establishes that there are buttons. Buttons in a computer display by definition may be selected and/or depressed. The final Office Action submits that the claimed system buttons are not distinguishable over Amro's icons. Applicant notes that Amro's icons 114 are not selectable and cannot be depressed. Accordingly, the mere use by Applicant of the term "button" differentiates Amro's icons from the present invention. Instead of displaying buttons, Amro merely displays an icon representative of the application associated with the icon (see col. 5, lines 43-58). Again, the claims do not provide for icons but "system buttons".

In response to the above, the Patent Office may rely on Amro Fig. 6. However, Applicant notes that while Fig. 6 displays a title bar in area 102, the title bar is NOT a size that exactly encompasses a title of the dialog window and system buttons as claimed. Further, FIG. 6 depicts the entire graphical selection area and not just a title bar as claimed (see col. 7, lines 31-43).

E. Claims 5, 15, and 25 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

These claims clearly set forth that the system buttons are in the same position on a display device (and not the particular location within the dialog window itself) when they are collapsed as when the complete window is displayed. In other words, the system buttons do not move from their current screen/display device location. As set forth in the specification (see page 11, lines 1-14) and required in the amended claims, the dialog window may collapse so that the system buttons do not move away from the cursor when the dialog window collapses or expands. In other words, while the movement of the cursor outside of the dialog window causes the collapse of the dialog window, the collapsing will not cause the system buttons to move further away from the cursor at the time the window collapses. Accordingly, the use of the system buttons is more easily conducted. The use of such claim limitations is illustrated in FIGS. 3 and 4 of the present invention wherein the dialog window 300 collapses to the top right. In other words, the title bar and system buttons remain in the same position so that if the user is moving towards or away from the dialog buttons, the buttons will not move. In addition, Applicant notes that when the cursor moves within the collapsed version of the dialog window, the complete dialog window is displayed. Since the system buttons remain in the same position in this situation, the cursor would remain within the window at the same distance from the system buttons as when the dialog window was in a collapsed form. Accordingly, the windows of the present invention are not expanding and collapsing in such a manner that the cursor is no longer located in a desirable location.

In the prior art, when a window expands, the expanded window is often relocated on the screen so that the user must reorient himself/herself with the new button location and move the cursor to such a location. The present invention avoids such relocating buttons by maintaining the buttons in the same location.

The final Office Action stated that it was unclear if a "screen display" refers to the entire contents displayed on a monitor/screen or a particular item displayed on the screen. Applicant has amended the claims such that the system buttons are displayed in the same position on a display device. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims now provide sufficient clarity.

The final Office Action also submitted that the claims were not clear if the system buttons were part of the dialog window. Applicant has amended the claims to state that the system buttons

are within the dialog window. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims now provide sufficient clarity.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that none of the cited references even remotely describe the present invention as set forth in the claims.

Moreover, the various elements of Applicant's claimed invention together provide operational advantages over the systems disclosed in AAPA, Rock, Amro, Microsoft® Word 2000 © 1999, and LaStrange. In addition, Applicant's invention solves problems not recognized by AAPA, Rock, Amro, Microsoft® Word 2000 © 1999, and LaStrange.

Thus, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 are allowable over AAPA, Rock, Amro, Microsoft® Word 2000 © 1999, and LaStrange. Further, dependent claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-30 are submitted to be allowable over AAPA, Rock, Amro, Microsoft® Word 2000 © 1999, and LaStrange in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, and because they contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-30 recite additional novel elements not shown by AAPA, Rock, Amro, Microsoft® Word 2000 © 1999, and LaStrange.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Stephen Webb

By his attorneys,

GATES & COOPER LLP

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: March 24, 2005

By: 

Name: Jason S. Feldmar

Reg. No.: 39,187

JSF/bjs/amb